arXiv:1506.06732v2 [math.CV] 7 Sep 2015

MAURER-CARTAN EQUATION IN THE DGLA OF GRADED DERIVATIONS AND NONEXISTENCE OF LEVI-FLAT HYPERSURFACES IN $\mathbb{CP}_2$

PAOLO DE BARTOLOMEIS AND ANDREI IORDAN

In the memory of Pierre Dolbeault

Abstract. Let M be a smooth manifold and Φ a differential 1-form on M with values in the tangent bundle TM. We construct canonical solutions e_Φ of Maurer-Cartan equation in the DGLA of graded derivations $\mathcal{D}^*(M)$ of differential forms on M by means of deformations of d depending on Φ. This yields to a classification of the canonical solutions of the Maurer-Cartan equation according to their type: e_Φ is of finite type r if there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Phi^r [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$ and r is minimal with this property, where $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathcal{FN}}$ is the Frölicher-Nijenhuis bracket. A distribution $\xi \subset TM$ of codimension $k \geqslant 1$ is integrable if and only if the canonical solution e_Φ associated to the endomorphism Φ of TM which is trivial on ξ and equal to the identity on a complement of ξ in TM is of finite type $\leqslant 1$, respectively of finite type 0 if $k = 1$.

If L is a Levi-flat hypersurface in a complex manifold, the Maurer-Cartan equation in the algebra of graded derivations leads to an elliptic partial differential equation of second order relevant to the Levi-flat deformations of L. By using this equation, we prove the nonexistence of smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces in the complex projective plane. This is a positive answer to a well-known conjecture of D. Cerveau.

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a domain with C^2 boundary in $\mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$, $\Omega = \{z \in U : \rho(z) < 0\}$ where ρ is a C^2 function defined in a neighborhood U of $\partial\Omega$ such that $d\rho \neq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. The Levi form introduced by E. E. Levi in [19] is the Hermitian form

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(z, w) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_i \partial \overline{z}_j}(z)\, w_i \overline{w}_j,\ z \in \partial\Omega,\ w \in T_z^{\mathbb{C}}(\partial\Omega)$$

where $T_z^{\mathbb{C}}(\partial\Omega) = T_z(\partial\Omega) \cap JT_z(\partial\Omega)$ is the maximal complex subspace contained in the tangent space $T_z(\partial\Omega)$ at z to $\partial\Omega$ and J is the standard complex structure of $\mathbb{C}^n$. The semipositivity of the Levi form characterizes the pseudoconvex domains of $\mathbb{C}^n$ ([24], [3], [23]).

A special situation occurs when the Levi form vanishes, i.e. $\partial\Omega$ is Levi-flat. One of the oldest results about the Levi-flat hypersurfaces and their connection with foliations by complex hypersurfaces is the following theorem of E. Cartan [5]: a

---

Date: August, 17, 2015.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32G10, 32E99, 16W25, 53C12.

Key words and phrases. Levi-flat hypersurface, Differential Graded Lie Algebras, Maurer-Cartan equation, Foliations, Graded derivations.

real analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is Levi-flat if and only if it is locally biholomorphic to a real hyperplane in $\mathbb{C}^n$. This result was generalized for smooth hypersurfaces by F. Sommer [27]: a smooth real hypersurface L in a complex manifold M is Levi-flat if and only if the distribution $\xi = TL \cap JTL$ is integrable, where J is the complex structure of M.

It is an elementary geometric fact that every smooth compact hypersurface in the Euclidean space contains a point of strict convexity. In particular this means that there are no smooth compact Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^n$. However, it can easily be seen that the images of affine real hyperplanes of $\mathbb{C}^n$ in the complex torus $\mathbb{T}_n$ are compact Levi-flat hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{T}_n$.

The situation is much more complicated for the complex projective space $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$, and is related to the exceptional minimals for holomorphic foliations of codimension 1 of $\mathbb{CP}_n$.

A classical theorem of Poincaré-Bendixson states that every leaf of a foliation on the real projective plane accumulates on a compact leaf or on a singularity of the foliation. As a codimension 1 holomorphic foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$, does not contain any compact leaf and its singular set $Sing\ \mathcal{F}$ is not empty, a major problem in foliation's theory is the following: can $\mathcal{F}$ contain a leaf F such that $\overline{F} \cap Sing\ \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$? If this is the case, then there exists a nonempty compact set K called exceptional minimal, invariant by $\mathcal{F}$ and minimal for the inclusion such that $K \cap Sing\ \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. The problem of the existence of an exceptional minimal in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$, is implicit in [4].

In [6] D. Cerveau proved a dichotomy under the hypothesis of the existence of a codimension 1 foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{CP}_n$ which admits an exceptional minimal $\mathfrak{M}$: $\mathfrak{M}$ is a real analytic Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, or there exists $p \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that the leaf through p has a hyperbolic holonomy and the range of the holonomy morphism is a linearisable abelian group. This gave rise to the conjecture of the nonexistence of smooth Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$.

This conjecture was proved for $n \geqslant 3$ by A. Lins Neto [21] for real analytic Levi-flat hypersurfaces and by Y.-T. Siu [25] for smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces. The methods of proofs for the real analytic case are very different from the smooth case and we will mention below some of this methods and the difficulties to extend them for $n = 2$.

Let L be a real analytic Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$. Then $\mathbb{CP}_n \backslash L$ is Stein and the Levi foliation on L extends to a codimension 1 holomorphic foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{CP}_n$. The singular set of $\mathcal{F}$ contains an analytic subset of codimension $n-2$. Thus this gives a contradiction for $n \geqslant 3$ [21].

Another method of proving the nonexistence of real analytic Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_n$ is by using the following theorem of A. Haefliger [14]: a compact real analytic manifold with finite fundamental group cannot admit a real analytic codimension 1 foliation. A variant of Lefschetz hyperplane theorem proved in [21] or [22] states that the homomorphism induced by the inclusion $\Pi_1(L) \rightarrow \Pi_1(\mathbb{CP}_n)$ is an isomorphism for $n \geqslant 3$ and this gives a contradiction. But this homomorphism is only surjective for $n = 2$.

Let now L be a smooth Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$. Then the normal bundle of the Levi foliation is trivial and it follows that its curvature form Θ is d-exact. Suppose that for every domain Ω in $\mathbb{CP}_n$ with smooth Levi-flat boundary and every $\overline{\partial}$-closed $(0,1)$-form smooth up to the boundary, there exists u smooth up to the boundary such that $\overline{\partial} u = f$. By using this solution of the $\overline{\partial}$- equation on both sides of $\mathbb{CP}_n \backslash L$ it is possible to find a smooth real function v on L such that $\Theta = \partial_b \overline{\partial}_b v$. This gives a contradiction at the point where v reaches its maximum, since the normal bundle of the Levi foliation is ample along the leaves as a quotient of the tangent space of $\mathbb{CP}_n$ (see [26]).

For $n \geqslant 3$, Y.-T. Siu [25] proved the existence of the solution of the $\overline{\partial}$-equation by using the fact that the bisectional curvature of $\mathbb{CP}_n$ is $n-2$-nondegenerate. In [15], G. M. Henkin and A. Iordan proved existence and regularity properties of the solution of $\overline{\partial}$-equation on pseudoconcave domains with Lipschitz boundaries in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$, under the hypothesis that f satisfies the so called moment condition: $\int_\Omega f \wedge h = 0$ for every $\overline{\partial}$-closed $(n, n-1)$-form h. The moment condition is verified for every $\overline{\partial}$-closed $(0,1)$-form if $n \geqslant 3$ and this leads to another proof of the nonexistence of smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 3$ [17].

Despite several attempts, the conjecture of the nonexistence of smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_2$ was not solved (see [17] for a discussion). In fact, the nonexistence of smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_2$ will imply the same result in dimensions $n \geqslant 2$ by taking hyperplane sections. Recent partial results concerning the nonexistence of Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_2$ may be found in the preprints of M. Adachi and J. Brinkschulte [1], [2] and S. Fu and M.-C. Shaw [11].

In the paper [7], the authors studied deformations of Levi-flat structures in complex manifolds and proved as an application the nonexistence of transversally parallelizable Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_2$. For this purpose, we elaborated a theory of deformations of integrable distributions of codimension 1 in smooth manifolds. Our approach was different of K. Kodaira and D. C. Spencer's in [18], where they developped a theory of deformations of the so called multifoliate structures, which are more general than the foliate structures (see remark 14 of [7] for a discussion).

In our approach of [7], where we considered only deformations of codimension 1 foliations, the DGLA algebra $(\mathcal{Z}^*(L), \delta, \{\cdot,\cdot\})$ associated to a codimension 1 foliation on a co-oriented manifold L is a subalgebra of the the algebra $(\Lambda^*(L), \delta, \{\cdot,\cdot\})$ of differential forms on L. Its definition depends on the choice of a DGLA defining couple (γ, X), where γ is a 1-differential form on L and X is a vector field on L such that $\gamma(X) = 1$, but the cohomology classes of the underlying differential vector space structure do not depend on its choice. The deformations are given by forms in $\mathcal{Z}^1(L)$ verifying the Maurer-Cartan equation and the moduli space takes in account the diffeomorphic deformations. The infinitesimal deformations along curves are subsets of of the first cohomology group of the DGLA $(\mathcal{Z}^*(L), \delta, \{\cdot,\cdot\})$. Then we adapted this theory to the study of the deformations of Levi-flat hypersurfaces.

We parametrized the Levi-flat hypersurfaces near a Levi-flat hypersurface in a complex manifold and we obtained a second order elliptic partial differential equation for the first order term of a Levi-flat deformation. In the case of transversally parallelizable hypersurfaces, this equation reduces to the Laplace equation and by applying the maximum principle, we proved the nonexistence of transversally parallelizable Levi-flat hypersurfaces L in a class of compact complex manifolds M with sufficiently many holomorphic vector fields, (i.e. for every $x \neq y \in M$, there exists a holomorphic vector field Y such that $Y(x) = 0$ and $Y(y) \oplus T_y L = M$) which contains $\mathbb{CP}_2$.

In this paper we consider the graded algebra of graded derivations defined by Frölicher and Nijenhuis in [10] with the DGLA structure defined by K. Kodaira and D. C. Spencer in [18]. We recall its definitions and properties in the second paragraph.

In the third paragraph, we construct canonical solutions of the Maurer-Cartan equation in this algebra by means of deformations of the d-operator depending on a vector valued differential 1-form Φ and in the fourth paragraph we give a classification of these solutions depending on their type. A canonical solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation associated to an endomorphism Φ is of finite type r if there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Phi^r [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$ and r is minimal with this property, where $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathcal{FN}}$ is the Frölicher-Nijenhuis bracket. We show that a distribution ξ of codimension k on a smooth manifold is integrable if and only if the canonical solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation associated to the endomorphism of the tangent space which is the trivial extension of the k-identity on a complement of ξ in TM is of finite type $\leqslant 1$. If ξ is a distribution of dimension s such that there exists an integrable distribution ξ^* of dimension d generated by ξ, we show that there exists locally an endomorphism Φ associated to ξ such that the canonical solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation associated to Φ is of finite type less than $r = \min\left\{m \in \mathbb{N} : \ m \geqslant \frac{d}{s}\right\}$.

A part of the results of these paragraphs will be used in the last paragraphs to prove the nonexistence of Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$. For a family of Levi-flat deformations of a Levi-flat hypersurface L in a complex manifold, the canonical solutions of the Maurer-Cartan equation in the algebra of graded derivations associated to an endomorphism which corresponds to a canonical DGLA defining couple, lead to a second order elliptic partial differential equation relevant to the Levi-flat deformations of L. The strong maximum principle of Hopf for the solutions of this equation implies a rigidity property for the Levi flat deformations and in the case of $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $n \geqslant 2$, this gives a contradiction.

More precisely, we suppose that L is a Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$ and Y a holomorphic vector field on $\mathbb{CP}_n$. We consider the Levi-flat deformation of L given by $\left(\Psi_t^Y(L)\right)_{t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[}$, where Ψ^Y is the flow of Y. Following our parametrization of hypersurfaces near L, this deformation is given by a family of smooth real valued functions $\left(a_t^Y\right)_{t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[}$ on L. By using a diffeomorphism $\Phi_{a_t^Y} : L \to \Psi_t^Y(L)$, we construct a DGLA defining couple $\left(\gamma_{a_t^Y}, X_{a_t^Y}\right)$ for a foliation on L which is diffeomorphic to the Levi foliation on $\Psi_t^Y(L)$. Since the codimension 1 foliations are associated to the canonical solutions of type 0 of the Maurer-Cartan equation in the algebra of graded derivations, we show that the function $p^Y = \frac{da_t^Y}{dt}_{|t=0}$ satisfies an elliptic second order partial differential equation along the leaves of the Levi foliation on L. The strong maximum principle of Hopf implies that p^Y is constant on the leaf through the point where p^Y reaches its maximum. If L is real analytic this leaf is dense in L and so p^Y is constant. But this gives a contradiction by choosing Y tangent to L at a point $x_0 \in L$ and normal to L in another point $y_0 \in L$.

The same method gives the nonexistence of Levi-flat hypersurfaces of class C^3 in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, by choosing x_0, y_0 as points in the minimal compact subset invariant by the Levi foliation.

2. The *DGLA* of graded derivations

In this paragraph we recall some definitions and properties of the DGLA of graded derivations from [10], [18] (see also [20]).

Notation 1. *Let M be a smooth manifold. We denote by $\Lambda^* M$ the algebra of differential forms on M, by $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ the Lie algebra of vector fields on M and by $\Lambda^* M \otimes TM$ the algebra of TM-valued differential form on M, where TM is the tangent bundle to M. In the sequel, we will identify $\Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ with the algebra $End(TM)$ of endomorphisms of TM by their canonical isomorphism: for $\sigma \in \Lambda^1 M$, $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, $(\sigma \otimes X)(Y) = \sigma(Y) X$.*

Definition 1. *A differential graded Lie agebra (DGLA) is a triple $(V^*, d, [\cdot,\cdot])$ such that:*

1) $V^* = \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} V^i$, where $\left(V^i\right)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a family of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces and $d : V^* \to V^*$ is a graded homomorphism such that $d^2 = 0$. An element $a \in V^k$ is said to be homogeneous of degree $k = \deg a$.

2) $[\cdot,\cdot] : V^* \times V^* \to V^*$ defines a structure of graded Lie algebra i.e. for homogeneous elements we have

$$[a,b] = -(-1)^{\deg a \deg b}[b,a]$$

and

$$[a,[b,c]] = [[a,b],c] + (-1)^{\deg a \deg b}[b,[a,c]]$$

3) d is compatible with the graded Lie algebra structure i.e.

$$d[a,b] = [da,b] + (-1)^{\deg a}[a,db].$$

Definition 2. *Let $(V^*, d, [\cdot,\cdot])$ be a DGLA and $a \in V^1$. We say that a verifies the Maurer-Cartan equation in $(V^*, d, [\cdot,\cdot])$ if*

$$da + \frac{1}{2}[a,a] = 0.$$

Definition 3. *Let $A = \oplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} A_k$ be a graded algebra. A linear mapping $D : A \to A$ is called a graded derivation of degree $p = |D|$ if $D : A_k \to A_{k+p}$ and $D(ab) = D(a)b + (-1)^{p \deg a} aD(b)$.*

Definition 4. *Let M be a smooth manifold. We denote by $\mathcal{D}^*(M)$ the graded algebra of graded derivations of $\Lambda^* M$.*

Definition 5. *Let P, Q be homogeneous elements of degree $|P|$, $|Q|$ of $\mathcal{D}^*(M)$. We define*

$$[P,Q] = PQ - (-1)^{|P||Q|} QP,$$

$$\daleth P = [d,P].$$

Lemma 1. *Let M be a smooth manifold. Then $(\mathcal{D}^*(M), [\cdot,\cdot], \daleth)$ is a DGLA.*

Definition 6. *Let $\alpha \in \Lambda^* M$ and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. We define $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\otimes X}$, $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha\otimes X}$ by*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\otimes X}\sigma = \alpha \wedge \mathcal{L}_X \sigma + (-1)^{|\alpha|} d\alpha \wedge \iota_X \sigma,\ \sigma \in \Lambda^*(M) \tag{2.1}$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{\alpha\otimes X}\sigma = \alpha \wedge \iota_X \sigma,\ \sigma \in \Lambda^*(M) \tag{2.2}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_X$ is the Lie derivative and ι_X the contraction by X.

For $\Phi \in \Lambda^* M \otimes TM$ we define $\mathcal{L}_\Phi$, $\mathcal{I}_\Phi$ as the extensions by linearity of (2.1), (2.2).

Remark 1. *Let $\omega \in \Lambda^2(M)$, $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $\sigma \in \Lambda^1(M)$. Then for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\omega\otimes Z}\sigma(X,Y) = (\omega \wedge \iota_Z\sigma)(X,Y) = \sigma(Z)\,\omega(X,Y) = \sigma((\omega\otimes Z)(X,Y)).$$

By linearity, for every $\Phi \in \Lambda^2 M \otimes TM$, $\sigma \in \Lambda^1(M)$, $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\Phi\sigma(X,Y) = \sigma(\Phi(X,Y)).$$

Lemma 2. *For every $\Phi \in \Lambda^k M \otimes TM$, $\mathcal{L}_\Phi$, $\mathcal{I}_\Phi \in \mathcal{D}^*(M)$, $|\mathcal{L}_\Phi| = k$, $|\mathcal{I}_\Phi| = k-1$.*

Notation 2.

$$\mathcal{L}(M) = \{\mathcal{L}_\Phi : \ \Phi \in \Lambda^* M \otimes TM\},\ \mathcal{I}(M) = \{\mathcal{I}_\Phi : \ \Phi \in \Lambda^* M \otimes TM\}.$$

In [10] the graded derivations of $\mathcal{L}(M)$ (respectively of $\mathcal{I}(M)$) are called of type d_* (respectively of type ι_*).

Lemma 3.
1. *For every $D \in \mathcal{D}^k(M)$ there exist unique forms $\Phi \in \Lambda^k M \otimes TM, \Psi \in \Lambda^{k+1} M \otimes TM$ such that*

   $$D = \mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{I}_\Psi,$$

   so

   $$\mathcal{D}^*(M) = \mathcal{L}(M) \oplus \mathcal{I}(M).$$

   We denote $\mathcal{L}_\Phi = \mathfrak{L}(D)$ and $\mathcal{I}_\Psi = \mathfrak{I}(D)$
2. *For every $\Phi \in \Lambda^* M \otimes TM$*

   $$\daleth (-1)^{|\Phi|}\mathcal{I}_\Phi = [\mathcal{I}_\Phi, d] = \mathcal{L}_\Phi. \tag{2.3}$$
3. $$\mathcal{L}(M) = \ker \daleth.$$

Notation 3. *We denote by $\aleph : \mathcal{D}^*(M) \to \mathcal{D}^*(M)$ the mapping defined by*

$$\aleph(D) = (-1)^{|D|}\mathcal{I}(D)$$

Remark 2.

$$Id = \daleth\aleph + \aleph\daleth.$$

Indeed for $D = \mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{I}_\Psi \in \mathcal{D}^*(M)$, by using Lemma 2 we have

$$(\daleth\aleph + \aleph\daleth)(D) = (\daleth\aleph + \aleph\daleth)(\mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{I}_\Psi) = \daleth(-1)^{|\Phi|}\mathcal{I}_\Phi + \aleph(-1)^{|\Phi|}\mathcal{L}_\Psi = \mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{I}_\Psi = D.$$

Lemma 4.
1. *Let $D \in \mathcal{D}^*(M)$. The following are equivalent:*
   - *i) $D \in \mathcal{I}(M)$;*
   - *ii) $D\big|\Lambda^0(M) = 0$;*
   - *iii) $D(f\omega) = fD(\omega)$ for every $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $\omega \in \Lambda^*(M)$.*
2. *The mapping $\mathcal{L} : \Lambda^* M \otimes TM \to \mathcal{D}^*(M)$ defined by $\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \mathcal{L}_\Phi$ is an injective morphism of graded Lie algebras.*

Remark 3. *$d \in \mathcal{D}^1(M)$ and*

$$d = \mathcal{L}_{Id_{T(M)}} = -\daleth\mathcal{I}_{Id_{T(M)}}.$$

By Lemma 1 and the Jacobi identity, for every $\Phi \in \Lambda^k M \otimes TM, \Psi \in \Lambda^l M \otimes TM$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\daleth([\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \mathcal{L}_\Psi]) &= [d, [\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \mathcal{L}_\Psi]] = [[d, \mathcal{L}_\Phi], \mathcal{L}_\Psi] + (-1)^{|\Phi|}[\mathcal{L}_\Phi, [d, \mathcal{L}_\Psi]] \\ &= [\daleth\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \mathcal{L}_\Psi] + (-1)^{|\Phi|}[\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \daleth\mathcal{L}_\Phi] = 0,\end{aligned}$$

so there exists a unique form $[\Phi,\Psi] \in \Lambda^{k+l}M \otimes TM$ such that

$$[\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \mathcal{L}_\Psi] = \mathcal{L}_{[\Phi,\Psi]}. \tag{2.4}$$

This gives the following

Definition 7. *Let $\Phi, \Psi \in \Lambda^* M \otimes TM$. The Frölicher-Nijenhuis bracket of Φ and Ψ is the unique form $[\Phi,\Psi]_{\mathcal{FN}} \in \Lambda^* M \otimes TM$ verifying (2.4).*

Lemma 5. *Let $\Phi_1 \in \Lambda^{k_1}M \otimes TM, \Phi_2 \in \Lambda^{k_2}M \otimes TM, \Psi_1 \in \Lambda^{k_1+1}M \otimes TM, \Psi_2 \in \Lambda^{k_2+1}M \otimes TM$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathcal{L}_{\Phi_1} + \mathcal{I}_{\Psi_1}, \mathcal{L}_{\Phi_2} + \mathcal{I}_{\Psi_2}] \quad &= \quad \mathcal{L}_{[\Phi_1,\Phi_2]_{\mathcal{FN}} + \mathcal{I}_{\Psi_1}\Phi_2 - (-1)^{k_1 k_2}\mathcal{I}_{\Psi_2}\Phi_1} \\ &\quad\; + \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{I}_{\Psi_1}\Psi_2 - (-1)^{k_1 k_2}\mathcal{I}_{\Psi_2}\Psi_1 + [\Phi_1,\Psi_2]_{\mathcal{FN}} - (-1)^{k_1 k_2}[\Phi_2,\Psi_1]_{\mathcal{FN}}}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular

$$[\mathcal{I}_\Phi, \mathcal{I}_\Psi] = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{I}_\Phi \Psi} - (-1)^{(|\Phi|+1)(|\Psi|+1)}\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{I}_\Psi \Phi}; \tag{2.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \mathcal{I}_\Psi] &= \mathcal{I}_{[\Phi,\Psi]_{\mathcal{FN}}} - (-1)^{|\Phi|(|\Psi|+1)}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_\Psi \Phi}; \\ [\mathcal{I}_\Psi, \mathcal{L}_\Phi] &= \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_\Psi \Phi} - (-1)^{|\Phi|}\mathcal{I}_{[\Psi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Definition 8. *Let $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$. The Nijenhuis tensor of Φ is $N_\Phi \in \Lambda^2 M \otimes TM$ defined by*

$$N_\Phi(X,Y) = [\Phi X, \Phi Y] + \Phi^2[X,Y] - \Phi[\Phi X, Y] - \Phi[X, \Phi Y], \;\; X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M).$$

Proposition 1. *Let $\alpha \in \Lambda^k(M)$, $\beta \in \Lambda^l(M)$, $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Then:*

(1)

$$\begin{aligned}[\alpha \otimes X, \beta \otimes Y]_{\mathcal{FN}} \quad &= \quad \alpha \wedge \beta \otimes [X,Y] + \alpha \wedge \mathcal{L}_X \beta \otimes Y - \mathcal{L}_Y \alpha \wedge \beta \otimes X \\ &\quad\; + (-1)^k (d\alpha \wedge \iota_X \beta \otimes Y + \iota_Y \alpha \wedge d\beta \otimes X).\end{aligned}$$

(2) *Let $\Phi, \Psi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}[\Phi,\Psi]_{\mathcal{FN}}(X,Y) \quad &= \quad [\Phi X, \Psi Y] - [\Phi Y, \Psi X] - \Psi[\Phi X, Y] + \Psi[\Phi Y, X] \\ &\quad\; - \Phi[\Psi X, Y] + \Phi[\Psi Y, X] + \frac{1}{2}\Psi(\Phi[X,Y]) - \frac{1}{2}\Psi(\Phi[Y,X]) \\ &\quad\; + \frac{1}{2}\Phi(\Psi[X,Y]) - \frac{1}{2}\Phi(\Psi[Y,X]) \\ &= \quad [\Phi X, \Psi Y] + [\Psi X, \Phi Y] + \Phi(\Psi[X,Y]) + \Psi(\Phi[X,Y]) \\ &\quad\; - \Phi[\Psi X, Y] - \Phi[X, \Psi Y] - \Psi[\Phi X, Y] - \Psi[X, \Phi Y].\end{aligned}$$

In particular

$$[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}(X,Y) = 2\big([\Phi X, \Phi Y] + \Phi^2[X,Y] - \Phi[\Phi X, Y] - \Phi[X, \Phi Y]\big) = 2N_\Phi(X,Y).$$

3. CANONICAL SOLUTIONS OF MAURER-CARTAN EQUATION

Definition 9. *Let $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$.*

a) Let $\sigma \in \Lambda^p M$. We define $\Phi\sigma \in \Lambda^p M$ by $\Phi\sigma = \sigma$ if $p = 0$ and

$$(\Phi\sigma)(V_1, \cdots, V_p) = \sigma(\Phi V_1, \cdots, \Phi V_p) \;\; if \;\; p \geqslant 1, \;\; V_1, \cdots, V_p \in \mathfrak{X}(M).$$

b) Let $\Psi \in \Lambda^p M \otimes TM$. We define $\Phi\Psi \in \Lambda^p M \otimes TM$ by $\Phi\Psi = \Psi$ if $p = 0$ and

$$\Phi\Psi(V_1, ..., V_p) = \Phi(\Psi(V_1, ..., V_p)), \;\; V_1, ..., V_p \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \;\; if \;\; p \geqslant 1.$$

Lemma 6. *Let* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$, $\Psi \in \Lambda^2 M \otimes TM$. *Then*

$$\mathcal{I}_\Psi \Phi = \Phi\Psi.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the assertion for $\Psi = \alpha \otimes X$, $\Phi = \beta \otimes Y$, $\alpha \in \Lambda^2(M)$, $\beta \in \Lambda^1(M)$, $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$.

For every $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ we have

$$(\beta \otimes Y)(\alpha \otimes X)(Z_1, Z_2) = (\beta \otimes Y)(\alpha(Z_1, Z_2) \otimes X) = \beta(X)\,\alpha(Z_1, Z_2) \otimes Y.$$

Since

$$\mathcal{I}_{\alpha\otimes X}\beta \otimes Y = (\mathcal{I}_{\alpha\otimes X}\beta) \otimes Y = \beta(X)\,\alpha \otimes Y,$$

the Lemma is proved. □

Definition 10. *Let* $D \in \mathcal{D}^k(M)$ *and* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *invertible. We define* $\Phi^{-1}D\Phi : \Lambda^* M \to \Lambda^* M$ *by* $\Phi^{-1}D\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi^{-1}D(\Phi\sigma)$.

Lemma 7. *Let* $D \in \mathcal{D}^k(M)$ *and* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *invertible. Then* $\Phi^{-1}D\Phi \in \mathcal{D}^k(M)$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \Lambda^p(M)$, $\eta \in \Lambda^q(M)$. Since $\Phi(\sigma \wedge \eta) = \Phi\sigma \wedge \Phi\eta$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\Phi^{-1}D\Phi\right)(\sigma \wedge \eta) &= \Phi^{-1}D(\Phi(\sigma \wedge \eta)) = \Phi^{-1}D(\Phi\sigma \wedge \Phi\eta) \\
&= \Phi^{-1}\left(D\Phi\sigma \wedge \Phi\eta + (-1)^{pk}\,\Phi\sigma \wedge D\Phi\eta\right) \\
&= \Phi^{-1}D\Phi\sigma \wedge \eta + (-1)^{pk}\,\sigma \wedge \Phi^{-1}D\Phi\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Notation 4. *Let* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *such that* $R_\Phi = Id_{TM} + \Phi$ *is invertible. Set*

$$d_\Phi = R_\Phi d R_\Phi^{-1},$$

$$e_\Phi = d_\Phi - d$$

and

$$b(\Phi) = -\frac{1}{2}R_\Phi^{-1}[\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}.$$

The following Theorem is a refinement of results from [8] and [9] :

Theorem 1. *Let* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *such that* $R_\Phi = Id_{T(M)} + \Phi$ *is invertible. Then*

$$e_\Phi = \mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)}. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Since both terms of (3.1) are derivations of degree 1, it is enough to prove (3.1) on $\Lambda^0(M)$ and $\Lambda^1(M)$.

Let $f \in \Lambda^0(M)$ and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Then

(3.2)

$$d_\Phi f(X) = \left(R_\Phi d R_\Phi^{-1} f\right)(X) = (R_\Phi df)(X) = df(Id_{TM} + \Phi)(X) = df(X) + df(\Phi(X)).$$

If $\alpha \in \Lambda^1(M)$, $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, by (2.2),

$$\mathcal{I}_{\alpha\otimes Y}(df)(X) = (\alpha \otimes \iota_Y df)(X) = df(Y)(\alpha(X)) = df(\alpha \otimes Y)X$$

and by linearity we obtain

$$\mathcal{I}_\Phi(df)(X) = df(\Phi(X)).$$

So, from (3.2) it follows that

$$d_\Phi f(X) = df(X) + \mathcal{I}_\Phi(df)(X) = (d + [\mathcal{I}_\Phi, d])f(X) = (d + \mathcal{L}_\Phi)f(X) = (d + \mathcal{L}_\Phi)f(X).$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_\Phi$ is of type i_*, $\mathcal{I}_\Phi f = 0$ and therefore (3.1) is verified for every $f \in \Lambda^0(M)$.

Let now $\sigma \in \Lambda^1(M)$.

We will prove firstly that

$$\mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)}(\sigma)(X,Y) = -\sigma\left(\frac{1}{2} R_\Phi^{-1} N_{R_\Phi}(X,Y)\right). \tag{3.3}$$

By using Remark 3, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\left[Id_{T(M)}, Id_{T(M)}\right]} = \left[\mathcal{L}_{Id_{T(M)}}, \mathcal{L}_{Id_{T(M)}}\right] = [d,d] = 0$$

and

$$\left[\mathcal{L}_\Phi, \mathcal{L}_{Id_{T(M)}}\right] = [\mathcal{L}_\Phi, d] = \daleth \mathcal{L}_\Phi = 0.$$

So

$$[R_\Phi, R_\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = \left[Id_{T(M)} + \Phi, Id_{T(M)} + \Phi\right]_{\mathcal{FN}} = [\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}$$

and by Proposition 1

$$2N_{R_\Phi} = [R_\Phi, R_\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = [\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 2N_\Phi. \tag{3.4}$$

By Remark 1 it follows that

$$\mathcal{I}_{-\frac{1}{2}R_\Phi^{-1}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}(\sigma)(X,Y) = -\sigma\left(\frac{1}{2}R_\Phi^{-1}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}(X,Y)\right) = -\sigma\left(\frac{1}{2}R_\Phi^{-1}N_{R_\Phi}(X,Y)\right)$$

and (3.3) is proved.

We will compute now $\mathcal{L}_\Phi\sigma$, $d_\Phi\sigma$ and $\mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)}\sigma$:

We remark that (2.3) gives $\mathcal{L}_\Phi\sigma = [\mathcal{I}_\Phi, d](\sigma)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_\Phi\sigma &= [\mathcal{I}_\Phi, d](\sigma)(X,Y) = (\mathcal{I}_\Phi d\sigma)(X,Y) - d(\mathcal{I}_\Phi\sigma)(X,Y) \\
&= d\sigma(\Phi X, Y) + d\sigma(X, \Phi Y) \\
&\quad -X((\mathcal{I}_\Phi\sigma)(Y)) + Y((\mathcal{I}_\Phi\sigma)(X)) + (\mathcal{I}_\Phi\sigma)[X,Y] \\
&= (\Phi X)(\sigma(Y)) - Y(\sigma(\Phi X)) - \sigma([\Phi X, Y]) \\
&\quad +X(\sigma(\Phi Y)) - (\Phi Y)(\sigma(X)) - \sigma([X,\Phi Y]) \\
&\quad -X(\sigma(\Phi(Y))) + Y(\sigma(\Phi(X))) + \sigma(\Phi([X,Y])) \\
&= (\Phi X)(\sigma(Y)) - (\Phi Y)(\sigma(X)) + \sigma(\Phi([X,Y]) - [\Phi X, Y] - [X, \Phi Y]), \qquad (3.5)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\Phi\sigma(X,Y) &= \left(R_\Phi d R_\Phi^{-1}\right)\sigma(X,Y) = \left(dR_\Phi^{-1}\sigma\right)(R_\Phi X, R_\Phi Y) \\
&= (R_\Phi X)\left(\left(R_\Phi^{-1}\sigma\right)(R_\Phi Y)\right) - (R_\Phi Y)\left(\left(R_\Phi^{-1}\sigma\right)(R_\Phi X)\right) - R_\Phi^{-1}\sigma([R_\Phi X, R_\Phi Y]) \\
&= (R_\Phi X)(\sigma Y) - (R_\Phi Y)(\sigma X) - \sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}([R_\Phi X, R_\Phi Y])\right) \\
&= (X + \Phi X)(\sigma Y) - (Y + \Phi Y)(\sigma X) - \sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}([R_\Phi X, R_\Phi Y])\right) \\
&= (\Phi X)(\sigma Y) - (\Phi Y)(\sigma X) + X(\sigma Y) - Y(\sigma X) - \sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}([R_\Phi X, R_\Phi Y])\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

By developping (3.3) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)}\sigma\right)(X,Y) &= -\sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}N_{R_\Phi}(X,Y)\right)\\
&= \sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}\left([R_\Phi X,R_\Phi Y]\right)+R_\Phi[X,Y]-[R_\Phi X,Y]-[X,R_\Phi Y]\right)\\
&= \sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}\left([R_\Phi X,R_\Phi Y]\right)\right)+\sigma\left([X,Y]+\Phi[X,Y]\right)\\
&\quad -\sigma\left([X,Y]+[\Phi X,Y]+[X,Y]+[X,\Phi Y]\right)\\
\text{(3.7)}\qquad &= \sigma\left(R_\Phi^{-1}\left([R_\Phi X,R_\Phi Y]\right)\right)+\sigma\left(\Phi[X,Y]-[X,Y]-[\Phi X,Y]-[X,\Phi Y]\right)\\
&\quad -\sigma\left([X,Y]+[\Phi X,Y]+[X,\Phi Y]\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Since

$$d\sigma(X,Y)=X(\sigma Y)-Y(\sigma X)-\sigma[X,Y],$$

by comparing (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) it follows that (3.1) is verified for each form in $\Lambda^1 M$ and the Lemma is proved. □

Theorem 2. *Let $\Phi\in\Lambda^1 M\otimes TM$ such that $R_\Phi=Id_{T(M)}+\Phi$ is invertible. Then:*

i) e_Φ is a solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation in $(\mathcal{D}^*(M),[\cdot,\cdot],\neg)$.

ii) Let $\Psi\in\Lambda^2 M\otimes TM$ such that $D=\mathcal{L}_\Phi+\mathcal{I}_\Psi$ is a solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation in $(\mathcal{D}^*(M),[\cdot,\cdot],\neg)$.) Than $\Psi=b(\Phi)$.

Proof. i) Since $[d,d]=0$, $\left[R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1},R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}\right]=0$, and $\left[d,R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}\right]=\left[R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1},d\right]$ it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\neg e_\Phi+\frac{1}{2}[e_\Phi,e_\Phi] &= \left[d,R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}-d\right]+\frac{1}{2}\left[R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}-d,R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}-d\right]\\
&= \left[d,R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}\right]-\left[d,R_\Phi dR_\Phi^{-1}\right]=0.
\end{aligned}
$$

ii) Let $D=\mathcal{L}_\Phi+\mathcal{I}_\Psi$, $\Phi\in\Lambda^1 M\otimes TM$, $\Psi\in\Lambda^2 M\otimes TM$. By using Lemma 1 and Lemma 5 we have

$$\neg D=\neg\mathcal{I}_\Psi=\mathcal{L}_\Psi$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
[D,D] &= [\mathcal{L}_\Phi+\mathcal{I}_\Psi,\mathcal{L}_\Phi+\mathcal{I}_\Psi]=\mathcal{L}_{[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+2[\mathcal{L}_\Phi,\mathcal{I}_\Psi]+[\mathcal{I}_\Psi,\mathcal{I}_\Psi]\\
&= \mathcal{L}_{[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+2\left(\mathcal{I}_{[\Phi,\Psi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_\Psi\Phi}\right)+[\mathcal{I}_\Psi,\mathcal{I}_\Psi],
\end{aligned}
$$

so

$$\neg D+\frac{1}{2}[D,D]=\mathcal{L}_\Psi+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+\left(\mathcal{I}_{[\Phi,\Psi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_\Psi\Phi}\right)+\frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{I}_\Psi,\mathcal{I}_\Psi].$$

It follows that

$$\mathfrak{L}\left(\neg D+\frac{1}{2}[D,D]\right)=\mathcal{L}_\Psi+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_\Psi\Phi}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{I}\left(\neg D+\frac{1}{2}[D,D]\right)=\mathcal{I}_{[\Phi,\Psi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}+\frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{I}_\Psi,\mathcal{I}_\Psi].$$

Suppose that $D=\mathcal{L}_\Phi+\mathcal{I}_\Psi$ verifies the Maurer-Cartan equation. Then

$$0=\mathcal{L}\left(\neg D+\frac{1}{2}[D,D]\right)=\mathcal{L}\left(\Psi+\frac{1}{2}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}+\mathcal{I}_\Psi\Phi\right).$$

Since $\mathcal{L}$ is injective, this implies

$$\Psi+\frac{1}{2}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}+\mathcal{I}_\Psi\Phi=0.$$

By Lemma 6 we obtain

$$\Psi + \frac{1}{2}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} + \Phi\Psi = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\Psi = -\frac{1}{2}\left(Id_{TM} + \Phi\right)^{-1}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = b\left(\Phi\right).$$

□

Definition 11. *Let $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ such that $Id_{T(M)} + \Phi$ is invertible. e_Φ is called the canonical solution of Maurer-Cartan equation associated to Φ.*

4. Canonical solutions of finite type of Maurer-Cartan equation

Theorem 3. *Let $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ small enough such that $\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}(-1)^h \Phi^h = \left(Id_{T(M)} + \Phi\right)^{-1} \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ and e_Φ the canonical solution of Maurer-Cartan equation associated to Φ. Then*

a) $e_\Phi = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\gamma_k$, where $\gamma_k \in \mathcal{D}^1(M)$ are defined by induction as

$$\gamma_1 = \mathcal{L}_\Phi,\ \gamma_k = -\left(-1\right)^k \frac{1}{2}\sum_{(p,q)\in\mathbb{N}^*,\ p+q=k} \aleph\left(\left[\gamma_p,\gamma_q\right]\right),\ k \geqslant 2.$$

b)

$$\gamma_k = \left(-1\right)^{k+1}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{k-2}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}},\ k \geqslant 2.$$

c)

$$\mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)} = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\gamma_k.$$

Proof. We remark that for $r \geqslant 2$, $\gamma_r \in \mathcal{I}(M)$, so by 2.5 it follows that $\left[\gamma_p,\gamma_q\right] \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ for $p,q \geqslant 2$. Since $\aleph\left|_{\mathcal{I}(M)}\right. = 0$ we have $\aleph\left(\left[\gamma_p,\gamma_q\right]\right) = 0$ for $p,q \geqslant 2$ and so

$$\gamma_r = -\left(-1\right)^r \frac{1}{2}\aleph\left(\left[\gamma_1,\gamma_{r-1}\right] + \left[\gamma_1,\gamma_{r-1}\right]\right) = -\left(-1\right)^r \aleph\left[\gamma_1,\gamma_{r-1}\right],\ r \geqslant 2. \tag{4.1}$$

We will show by induction that for every $r \geqslant 2$

$$\gamma_r = -\left(-1\right)^r \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-2}[\Phi,\Phi]}. \tag{4.2}$$

Suppose that for every $r \geqslant 3$

$$\gamma_{r-1} = -\left(-1\right)^k \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]}.$$

Then

$$\aleph\left[\gamma_1,\gamma_{r-1}\right] = \aleph\left[\mathcal{L}_\Phi, -\left(-1\right)^{r-1}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]}\right], \tag{4.3}$$

and by 2.6 we have

(4.4)

$$\left[\mathcal{L}_\Phi,\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]}\right] = \left[\mathcal{I}_{\left[\Phi,\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}\right]_{\mathcal{FN}}} - \left(-1\right)^{|\Phi|\left(\left|\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]\right|+1\right)}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}\Phi}\right].$$

So, from (4.3) and (4.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.5)\qquad \aleph\left[\gamma_1,\gamma_{r-1}\right] &= -\frac{1}{2}(-1)^{r-1}\aleph\left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}\Phi}\right)\\
&= -\frac{1}{2}(-1)^{r-1}(-1)^{\left|\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}\Phi\right|}\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}\Phi}\\
&= -\frac{1}{2}(-1)^{r}\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}\Phi}.
\end{aligned}$$

But by Lemma 6

$$\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^{r-3}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}}\Phi = \Phi^{r-2}\left[\Phi,\Phi\right]_{\mathcal{FN}}$$

and (4.2) is verified.

It follows that

$$\mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)} = \mathcal{I}_{-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(-1)^k\Phi^k[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} -(-1)^k\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{I}_{\Phi^k[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}} = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\gamma_k.$$

By Theorem 3.1

$$e_\Phi = \mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\gamma_k$$

and the Proposition is proved. □

Definition 12. *Let* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *small enough such that* $\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}(-1)^h\Phi^h = \left(Id_{T(M)}+\Phi\right)^{-1} \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *and* e_Φ *the canonical solution of Maurer-Cartan equation associated to* Φ*.* e_Φ *is called of finite type if there exists* $r \in \mathbb{N}$ *if* $\Phi^r\left[\Phi,\Phi\right]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$ *and of finite type* r *if* $r = \min\left\{s \in \mathbb{N} :\ \Phi^s\left[\Phi,\Phi\right]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0\right\}$.

Remark 4. *Let* e_Φ *the canonical solution of Maurer-Cartan equation corresponding to* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$*. Suppose that* e_Φ *is of finite type* r*. Then*

$$e_\Phi = \sum_{k=1}^{r+1}\gamma_k.$$

Proposition 2. *Let* $\Phi \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$ *such that* R_Φ *is invertible. The following are equivalent:*

i) The canonical solution e_Φ *of Maurer-Cartan equation coresponding to* Φ *is of finite type* 0.

ii) e_Φ *is* $\daleth$*-closed.*

iii) d_Φ *is* $\daleth$*-closed.*

iv) $N_\Phi = 0$.

Proof. i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ *ii)* Suppose that the canonical solution e_Φ of Maurer-Cartan equation coresponding to Φ is of finite type 0. Then by Remark 4 it follows that

$$e_\Phi = \gamma_1 = \mathcal{L}_\Phi$$

and by Lemma 2 it follows that e_Φ is $\daleth$-closed.

Conversely, suppose $\daleth e_\Phi = 0$. By using again Lemma 2 it follows that $e_\Phi \in \mathcal{L}(M)$. In particular $\mathcal{I}_{b(\Phi)} = 0$, so $[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$.

ii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ *iii)* We have $d = \mathcal{L}_{Id_{T(M)}}$, so $\daleth d = 0$. Since $e_\Phi = d_\Phi - d$ the assertion follows.

i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ *iv)* By Proposition 1, $[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 2N_\Phi$ so $N_\Phi = 0$ if and only if $[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$. □

By using Proposition 2 we obtain:

Corollary 1. *Let M be a smooth manifold and J an almost complex structure on M. Then the canonical solution associated to J is of finite type 0 if and only if $N_J = 0$, i.e. if and only if J is integrable.*

Theorem 4. *Let M be a smooth manifold and $\xi \subset TM$ a distribution. Let $\zeta \subset TM$ such that $TM = \xi \oplus \zeta$ and consider $\Phi \in End(TM)$ defined by $\Phi = 0$ on ξ and $\Phi = Id$ on ζ. Then:*

1. *The canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type 0 if and only if ξ and ζ are integrable.*
2. *The canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type 1 if and only if ξ is integrable and ζ is not integrable.*
3. *If ξ is not integrable then $\Phi^k [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} \neq 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let $Y, Z \in \xi$. Since $\Phi^k = \Phi$ for every $k \geqslant 1$ and $\Phi Y = \Phi Z = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\Phi [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}})(Y, Z) &= \Phi([\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}(Y, Z)) \\ &= \Phi\left([\Phi Y, \Phi Z] + \Phi^2 [Y, Z] - \Phi [\Phi Y, Z] - \Phi [Y, \Phi Z]\right) = \Phi([Y, Z]) .\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Suppose that the canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type $\leqslant 1$. Then $\Phi [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}(Y, Z) = 0$ for every $Y, Z \in \xi$ and by (4.6 it follows that $[Y, Z] \in \xi$. Therefore ξ is integrable by the theorem of Frobenius.

Suppose now that ξ is not integrable. There exist $Y, Z \in \xi$ such that $[Y, Z] \notin \xi$. By (4.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\Phi^k [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}\right)(Y, Z) &= \Phi^k \left([\Phi Y, \Phi Z] + \Phi^{k+2} [Y, Z] - \Phi^{k+1} [\Phi Y, Z] - \Phi^{k+1} [Y, \Phi Z]\right) \\ &= \Phi([Y, Z]) \neq 0\end{aligned}$$

for every $k \geqslant 1$.

Conversely, suppose that ξ is integrable. Then for every $V, W \in \xi$, we have $[V, W] \in \xi$, so $\Phi([V, W]) = 0$. Since $\Phi(TM) \subset \zeta$, for every $V \in TM$, there exist unique $V_\xi \in \xi$ and $V_\zeta \in \zeta$ such that $V = V_\xi + V_\zeta$, and $\Phi V = V_\zeta$. Since $\Phi^k = \Phi$ for every $k \geqslant 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\Phi [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}})(V, W) &= \Phi([\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}(V, W)) \\ &= \Phi\left([\Phi V, \Phi W] + \Phi^2 [V, W] - \Phi [\Phi V, W] - \Phi [V, \Phi W]\right) \\ &= \Phi([V_\zeta, W_\zeta]) + \Phi([V_\xi + V_\zeta, W_\xi + W_\zeta]) \\ &\quad -\Phi([V_\zeta, W_\xi + W_\zeta]) - \Phi([V_\xi + V_\zeta, W_\zeta]) \\ &= \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] + \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\xi] + \Phi [V_\xi, W_\zeta] + \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] \\ &\quad -\Phi [V_\zeta, W_\xi] - \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] - \Phi [V_\xi, W_\zeta] - \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

and it follows that the canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type $\leqslant 1$.

If ζ is integrable too, $\Phi [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] = [V_\zeta, W_\zeta]$ for every $V, W \in TM$ and

$$\begin{aligned}([\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}})(V, W) &= [\Phi V, \Phi W] + \Phi^2 [V, W] - \Phi [\Phi V, W] - \Phi [V, \Phi W] \\ &= [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] + \Phi [V_\xi + V_\zeta, W_\xi + W_\zeta] \\ &\quad -\Phi [V_\zeta, W_\xi + W_\zeta] - \Phi [V_\xi + V_\zeta, W_\zeta] \\ &= [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] + \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\xi] + \Phi [V_\xi, W_\zeta] - \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\xi] - \Phi [V_\zeta, W_\zeta] = 0,\end{aligned}$$

so the canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type 0.

If ξ is integrable and ζ is not integrable, there exists $Y, Z \in \zeta$ such that $[Y, Z] \notin \zeta$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\left([\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}\right)[Y,Z] &= [\Phi Y, \Phi Z] + \Phi^2 [Y,Z] - \Phi[\Phi Y, Z] - \Phi[Y, \Phi Z] \\ &= [Y,Z] + \Phi[Y,Z] - \Phi[Y,Z] - \Phi[Y,Z] = [Y,Z] - \Phi[Y,Z] \neq 0\end{aligned}$$

and the Theorem follows. □

Corollary 2. *Let M be a smooth manifold and $\xi \subset TM$ a co-orientable distribution of codimension 1. There exist $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $\gamma \in \Lambda^1(M)$ such $\xi = \ker \gamma$ and $\iota_X \gamma = 1$. We have $T(M) = \xi \oplus \mathbb{R}[X]$ and we consider $\Phi \in End(TM)$ defined by $\Phi = 0$ on ξ and $\Phi = Id$ on $\mathbb{R}[X]$. Then the canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type 0 if and only if ξ is integrable.*

Proof. We apply Proposition 4 for $\eta = \mathbb{R}[X]$ which is obviously integrable. □

Theorem 5. *Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension n and $\xi, \tau \subset TM$ distributions such that $\xi \subsetneqq \tau$. We consider $\eta, \zeta \subset TM$ distributions such that $\tau = \xi \oplus \eta$ and $TM = \tau \oplus \zeta$ and let $A : \eta \to \xi$, $B : \eta \to \eta$ such that $\xi = \ker K$, where $K : \tau \to \tau$ is defined by $K = 0$ on ξ and $K = A + B$ on η. We suppose that there exists a natural number $m \geqslant 1$ such that $K^m = 0$. Let $\Phi \in End(TM)$ defined by $\Phi = K$ on τ and $\Phi = Id$ on ζ. The following are equivalent:*

1. *τ is integrable.*
2. *The canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type $\leqslant m$.*

Proof. We have

$$K = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \underbrace{\dim \xi} & \underbrace{\dim \eta} \\ \dim \xi \,\{ & 0 & A \\ \dim \eta \,\{ & 0 & B \end{array}\right)$$

and

$$\Phi = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \underbrace{\dim \tau} & \underbrace{\dim \zeta} \\ \dim \tau \,\{ & K & 0 \\ \dim \zeta \,\{ & 0 & Id \end{array}\right),$$

So $K^m = 0$, $\Phi^m = 0$ on τ and $\Phi^m = Id$ on ζ.

Let $Y, Z \in TM$, $Y = Y_\tau + Y_\zeta$, $Y_\tau = Y_\xi + Y_\eta$, $Z = Z_\tau + Z_\zeta$, $Z_\tau = Z_\xi + Z_\eta$, $Y_\xi, Z_\xi \in \xi$, $Y_\eta, Z_\eta \in \eta$, $Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta \in \zeta$. We have $\Phi^{m+j} = \Phi^m$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\Phi^m [\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}\right)[Y,Z] &= \Phi^m \left([\Phi Y, \Phi Z] + \Phi^2 [Y,Z] - \Phi[\Phi Y, Z] - \Phi[Y, \Phi Z]\right) \\ &= \Phi^m [\Phi Y, \Phi Z] + \Phi^m [Y,Z] - \Phi^m [\Phi Y, Z] - \Phi^m [Y, \Phi Z]. \qquad (4.7)\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that τ is integrable. Since $\xi = \ker \Phi$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi Y &= \Phi Y_\eta + \Phi Y_\zeta = A Y_\eta + B Y_\eta + Y_\zeta = C_\tau + Y_\zeta, \\ \Phi Z &= \Phi Z_\eta + \Phi Z_\zeta = A Z_\eta + B Z_\eta + Z_\zeta = D_\tau + Y_\zeta,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_\tau = A Y_\eta + B Y_\eta \in \tau$ and $D_\tau = A Z_\eta + B Z_\eta \in \tau$. Since τ is integrable, $[C_\tau, D_\tau] \in \tau = Ker\ \Phi^m$, so $\Phi^m ([C_\tau, D_\tau]) = 0$ and

$$\Phi^m [\Phi Y, \Phi Z] = \Phi^m ([C_\tau, Z_\zeta]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, D_\tau]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]). \qquad (4.8)$$

Similarly, since $[Y_\tau, Z_\tau]$, $[C_\tau, Z_\tau]$, $[Y_\tau, D_\tau] \in \tau = Ker\ \Phi^m$

(4.9)

$$\Phi^m [Y,Z] = \Phi^m ([Y_\tau + Y_\zeta, Z_\tau + Z_\zeta]) = \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, Z_\tau]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\tau, Z_\zeta]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]),$$

(4.10)

$$\Phi^m [\Phi Y, Z] = \Phi^m [C_\tau + Y_\zeta, Z_\tau + Z_\zeta] = \Phi^m [C_\tau, Z_\zeta] + \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, Z_\tau] + \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta] .$$

(4.11)

$$\Phi^m [Y, \Phi Z] = \Phi^m [Y_\tau + Y_\zeta, D_\tau + Z_\zeta] = \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, D_\tau] + \Phi^m [Y_\tau, Z_\zeta] + \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]$$

Replacing (4.8), (4.9), (4.10), (4.11) in (4.7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\Phi^m [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}\right)[Y, Z] &= \Phi^m ([C_\tau, Z_\zeta]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, D_\tau]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]) \\ &\quad + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, Z_\tau]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\tau, Z_\zeta]) + \Phi^m ([Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]) \\ &\quad - (\Phi^m [C_\tau, Z_\zeta] + \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, Z_\tau] + \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]) \\ &\quad - (\Phi^m [Y_\zeta, D_\tau] + \Phi^m [Y_\tau, Z_\zeta] + \Phi^m [Y_\zeta, Z_\zeta]) \\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

and it follows that the canonical solution associated to Φ is of finite type $\leqslant m$.

Conversely, suppose that the canonical solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation associated to Φ is of finite type $k \leqslant m$, i.e. $\Phi^m [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$. We will prove that $[Y, Z] \in \tau = Ker\ \Phi^m$ for every $Y, Z \in \tau$ by taking in account several cases.

a) Let $Y, Z \in \xi$. Then $\Phi Y = \Phi Z = 0$ and by using (4.7) we obtain

$$\Phi^m [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} ([Y, Z]) = \Phi^{m+2} [Y, Z] = \Phi^m [Y, Z] = 0.$$

So $[Y, Z] \in \tau$.

b) Let $Y \in \xi, Z \in \tau$, $Z = Z_\xi + Z_\eta$. Then

$$[Y, Z] = [Y, Z_\xi] + [Y, Z_\eta] . \tag{4.12}$$

By a) $[Y, Z_\xi] \in \tau$ and from (4.12) it follows that $[Y, Z] \in \tau$ if and only if $[Y, Z_\eta] \in \tau$.

Since $\Phi Y = 0$, by using (4.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}[\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} ([Y, Z_\eta]) &= [\Phi Y, \Phi Z_\eta] + \Phi^2 [Y, Z_\eta] - \Phi [\Phi Y, Z_\eta] - \Phi [Y, \Phi Z_\eta] \\ &= \Phi^2 [Y, Z_\eta] - \Phi [Y, \Phi Z_\eta] ,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^m [\Phi, \Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}} ([Y, Z_\eta]) &= \Phi^m [Y, Z_\eta] - \Phi^m [Y, \Phi Z_\eta] \\ &= \Phi^m ([Y, (Id - \Phi) Z_\eta]) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

In particular $[Y, (Id - \Phi) Z_\eta] \in \tau$ for every $Z_\eta \in \eta$.

But

$$\det \left(Id - \Phi_{|\eta}\right) = \det (Id - B) = 1, \tag{4.13}$$

so for every $X_\eta \in \eta$ there exists $Z_\eta \in \eta$ such that $X_\eta = (Id - \Phi) Z_\eta$. It follows that $[Y, Z] \in \tau$ for every $Y \in \xi$ and $Z \in \tau$.

c) Let $Y, Z \in \tau$, $Y = Y_\xi + Y_\eta$, $Z = Z_\xi + Z_\eta$, $Y_\xi, Z_\xi \in \xi$ $Y_\eta, Z_\eta \in \eta$. Since

$$[Y, Z] = [Y_\xi + Y_\eta, Z_\xi + Z_\eta] = [Y_\xi, Z_\xi] + [Y_\eta, Z_\xi] + [Y_\xi, Z_\eta] + [Y_\eta, Z_\eta] .$$

and $[Y_\xi, Z_\xi] , [Y_\eta, Z_\xi] , [Y_\xi, Z_\eta] \in \tau$ it follows that $[Y, Z] \in \tau$ if and only if $[Y_\eta, Z_\eta] \in \tau$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}([Y_\eta,Z_\eta]) &= [\Phi Y_\eta,\Phi Z_\eta]+\Phi^2[Y_\eta,Z_\eta]-\Phi[\Phi Y_\eta,Z_\eta]-\Phi[Y_\eta,\Phi Z_\eta]\\ &= [AY_\eta+BY_\eta,AZ_\eta+BZ_\eta]+\Phi^2[Y_\eta,Z_\eta]\\ &\quad -\Phi[AY_\eta+BY_\eta,Z_\eta]-\Phi[Y_\eta,AZ_\eta+BZ_\eta].\end{aligned}$$

Since $AY_\eta, AZ_\eta \in \xi$ it follows that $[AY_\eta,AZ_\eta],[AY_\eta,BZ_\eta],[BY_\eta,AZ_\eta],[AY_\eta,Z_\eta],[Y_\eta,AZ_\eta]\in \tau=\ker\Phi^r$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^m[\Phi,\Phi]_{\mathcal{FN}}([Y_\eta,Z_\eta]) &= \Phi^m[BY_\eta,BZ_\eta]+\Phi^m[Y_\eta,Z_\eta]-\Phi^m[BY_\eta,Z_\eta]-\Phi^m[Y_\eta,BZ_\eta]\\ &= \Phi^m[Y_\eta,(Id-B)Z_\eta]-\Phi^m[BY_\eta,(Id-B)Z_\eta]\\ &= \Phi^m[(Id-B)Y_\eta,(Id-B)Z_\eta]=0\end{aligned}$$

for every $Y_\eta, Z_\eta \in \eta$.

As before, by (4.13) it follows that $\Phi^r[Y_\eta,Z_\eta]=0$ for every $Y_\eta,Z_\eta\in\eta$ and this implies that $[Y,Z]\in\tau$ for every $Y,Z\in\tau$. □

In order to compute the type of the canonical solution of Theorem 5 we need the following elementary lemma:

Lemma 8. *Let*

$$K=\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \underbrace{s} & \underbrace{d-s}\\ s\,\{ & 0 & A\\ d-s\,\{ & 0 & B\end{array}\right)$$

a (d,d) *nilpotent matrix of rank* $d-s>0$, $s\geqslant 1$. *Set* $r=\min\{m\in\mathbb{N}:\ K^m=0\}$. *Then* $r=\min\left\{m\in\mathbb{N}:\ m\geqslant \frac{d}{s}\right\}$.

Proof. Since K is nilpotent of maximal rank we may suppose that

$$K=\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \underbrace{s} & \underbrace{d-s}\\ s\,\{ & 0 & Id\\ d-s\,\{ & 0 & 0\end{array}\right).$$

By induction it follows that if $d-js>0$, we have

$$K^j=\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \underbrace{js} & \underbrace{d-js}\\ js\,\{ & 0 & Id\\ d-js\,\{ & 0 & 0\end{array}\right)\neq 0$$

and $K^j=0$ for each $j\in\mathbb{N}^*$ such that $d-js\leqslant 0$. □

Notation 5. *Let* $\xi\subset TM$ *a distribution. We denote by* ξ^* *the smallest involutive subset of* TM *such that* $\xi\subset\xi^*$. *If* $\mathcal{E}=\{X_1,\cdots,X_s\}$ *are generators of* ξ *on an open subset* U *of* M, *then for every* $x\in U$, ξ^*_x *is the linear subspace of* T_xM *generated by* $[X_{i_1},[X_{i_2},[\cdots,X_{i_k}]]](x)$, $k\geqslant 1$, $1\leqslant i_k\leqslant s$.

Remark 5. *If* $\dim\xi^*_x$ *is independent of* x, ξ^* *is a distribution, but in general* $\dim\xi^*_x$ *depends on* x. *If* ξ^* *is a distribution, then* ξ^* *is the smallest integrable distribution containing* ξ [28].

Corollary 3. *Let* M *be a smooth manifold of dimension* n, $\xi\subset TM$ *a distribution of dimension* s *such that* ξ^* *is a distribution of dimension* d. *Then for every* $x\in M$ *there exists a neighborhood* U *of* x *and* $\Phi\in\Lambda^1(U,TU)$ *such that the canonical solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation associated to* Φ *is of finite type* $\leqslant r$, *where* $r=\min\left\{m\in\mathbb{N}:\ m\geqslant\frac{d}{s}\right\}$.

Proof. If ξ is integrable, $d = s$, $r = 1$ and the corollary follows from Theorem 4.

Suppose that ξ is not integrable, i. e. $d > s$. For each $x \in M$ there exists a neighborhood U of x and a basis $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ of TM on U such that $(X_1, \cdots, X_s)$ is a basis of ξ and $(X_1, \cdots, X_d)$ is a basis of ξ^* on U.

We define $\Phi \in End\,(TU)$ as $\Phi X_i = 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, s$ $\Phi\,(X_i) = X_{i-s}$, $i = s+1, \cdots, d$, $\Phi\,(X_i) = X_i$, $i = d+1, \cdots, n$. Then the matrix of Φ in the basis $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ is

$$\Phi = \left(\begin{array}{rcc} & \underbrace{d} & \underbrace{n-d} \\ d\ \{ & K & 0 \\ n-d\ \{ & 0 & Id \end{array}\right)$$

where

$$K = \left(\begin{array}{rcc} & \underbrace{s} & \underbrace{d-s} \\ s\ \{ & 0 & Id \\ d-s\ \{ & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right).$$

Since $r \geqslant 2$, by Lemma 8 and Theorem 5, the canonical equation solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation associated to Φ is of finite type $\leqslant r$. □

5. Deformations of foliations of codimension 1

Definition 13. *By a differentiable family of deformations of an integrable distribution ξ we mean a differentiable family $\omega : \mathcal{D} = (\xi_t)_{t \in I} \mapsto t \in I =]-a, a[$, $a > 0$, of integrable distributions such that $\xi_0 = \omega^{-1}(0) = \xi$.*

Remark 6. *An integrable distribution ξ of codimension 1 in a smooth manifold L is called co-orientable if the normal space to the foliation defined by ξ is orientable. We recall that ξ is co-orientable if and only if there exists a 1-form γ on L such that $\xi = \ker\ \gamma$ (see for ex.* [13]*). A couple (γ, X) where $\gamma \in \wedge^1(L)$ and X is a vector field on L such that $\ker\ \gamma = \xi$ and $\gamma(X) = 1$ was called a DGLA defining couple in* [7].

If $(\xi_t)_{t \in I}$ is a differentiable family of deformations of an integrable co-orientable distribution ξ, then the distribution ξ_t is co-orientable for t small enough. So, if ξ is an integrable co-orientable distribution of codimension 1 in L and $(\xi_t)_{t \in I}$ is a differentiable family of deformations of ξ we may consider a DGLA defining couple (γ_t, X_t) for every t small enough such that $t \mapsto (\gamma_t, X_t)$ is differentiable on a neighborhood of the origin.

Lemma 9. *Let L be a C^∞ manifold and $\xi \subset T(L)$ a co-orientable distribution of codimension 1. Let (γ, X) be a DGLA defining couple and denote $\Phi \in End\,(TM)$ the endomorphism corresponding to $\gamma \otimes X \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$. Then Φ is defined on $TM = \xi \oplus \mathbb{R}[X]$ as $\Phi = 0$ on ξ and $\Phi = Id$ on $\mathbb{R}[X]$.*

Proof. Let $Y = Y_\xi + \lambda X$ vector fields on L, $V_\xi \in \xi$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$(\gamma \otimes X)(Y) = \gamma(Y)\,X = \gamma(Y_\xi + \lambda X)\,X = \lambda X.$$

□

Lemma 10. *Let L be a C^∞ manifold and $\xi \subset T(L)$ a co-orientable distribution of codimension 1. Let (γ, X) be a DGLA defining couple. Then the following are equivalent:*

i) ξ is integrable;

ii) $d\gamma = -\iota_X d\gamma \wedge \gamma$.

iii) $[\gamma \otimes X, \gamma \otimes X]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$.

Proof. *i)* $\iff$ *ii)* is a variant of the theorem of Frobenius and it was proved in [7].

ii) $\iff$ *iii)*. We have

$$\begin{aligned}[\gamma \otimes X, \gamma \otimes X]_{\mathcal{FN}} &= \gamma \wedge \mathcal{L}_X \gamma \otimes X - \mathcal{L}_X \gamma \wedge \gamma \otimes X - (d\gamma \wedge \iota_X \gamma \otimes X + \iota_X \gamma \wedge d\gamma \otimes X) \\ &= 2\gamma \wedge \mathcal{L}_X \gamma \otimes X - 2d\gamma \otimes X = 2 (\gamma \wedge d\iota_X \gamma + \gamma \wedge \iota_X d\gamma - d\gamma) \otimes X \\ &= 2 (\gamma \wedge \iota_X d\gamma - d\gamma) \otimes X.\end{aligned}$$

□

We recall the following lemma from [7]:

Lemma 11. *Let L be a C^∞ manifold and X a vector field on L. For $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda^* (L)$, set*

$$\{\alpha, \beta\} = \mathcal{L}_X \alpha \wedge \beta - \alpha \wedge \mathcal{L}_X \beta \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_X$ is the Lie derivative. Then $(\Lambda^* (L), d, \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ is a DGLA.

Proposition 3. *Let L be a C^2 manifold and $\xi \subset T(L)$ an integrable co-orientable distribution of codimension 1. Let $(\xi_t)_{t \in I}$ be a differentiable family of deformations of ξ such that ξ_t is co-orientable and integrable for every $t \in I$ and let (γ_t, X_t) a DGLA defining couple for ξ_t such that $t \mapsto (\gamma_t, X_t)$ is differentiable on I. Denote $\gamma = \gamma_0$, $\alpha = \frac{d\gamma_t}{dt}_{|t=0}$, $X = X_0$, $Y = \frac{dX_t}{dt}_{|t=0}$. Then*

$$\delta\alpha + \mathcal{L}_Y \gamma \wedge \gamma = 0$$

where

$$\delta = d + \{\gamma, \cdot\}$$

and $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is defined in (5.1).

In particular $\delta\alpha (V, W) = 0$ for every vector fields V, W tangent to ξ.

Proof. Since

$$\gamma_t (X_t) = (\gamma + t\alpha + o(t)) (X + tY + o(t)) = 1 + t (\alpha (X) + \gamma (Y)) + o(t) = 1$$

it follows that

$$\alpha (X) + \gamma (Y) = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Denote $\sigma (t) = \gamma_t \otimes X_t \in \Lambda^1 M \otimes TM$. By Corollary 2 and Lemma 9 the canonical solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation in $(\mathcal{D}^* (L), [\cdot, \cdot], \daleth)$ associated to $\sigma (t)$ is of finite type 0 for each t, so $[\sigma (t), \sigma (t)]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$ for every t. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma (t) &= \gamma_t \otimes X_t = (\gamma + t\alpha + o(t)) \otimes (X + tY + o(t)) \\ &= \gamma \otimes X + t (\alpha \otimes X + \gamma \otimes Y) + o(t)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$[\sigma (t), \sigma (t)]_{\mathcal{FN}} = [\gamma \otimes X, \gamma \otimes X]_{\mathcal{FN}} + 2t ([\gamma \otimes X, \alpha \otimes X + \gamma \otimes Y]_{\mathcal{FN}}) + o(t).$$

By Lemma 10, $[\gamma \otimes X, \gamma \otimes X]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0$, so

$$[\sigma (t), \sigma (t)]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 2t ([\gamma \otimes X, \alpha \otimes X + \gamma \otimes Y]_{\mathcal{FN}}) + o(t) = 0$$

and it follows that

$$[\gamma \otimes X, \alpha \otimes X + \gamma \otimes Y]_{\mathcal{FN}} = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

But Proposition 1 gives

$$\begin{aligned}[\gamma\otimes X,\alpha\otimes X]_{\mathcal{FN}} &= \gamma\wedge\mathcal{L}_X\alpha\otimes X-\mathcal{L}_X\gamma\wedge\alpha\otimes X-(d\gamma\wedge\iota_X\alpha\otimes X+\iota_X\gamma\wedge d\alpha\otimes X)\\ &= -\{\gamma,\alpha\}\otimes X-\alpha(X)\,d\gamma\otimes X-d\alpha\otimes X\\ &= -\delta\alpha\otimes X-\alpha(X)\,d\gamma\otimes X \qquad (5.4)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}[\gamma\otimes X,\gamma\otimes Y]_{\mathcal{FN}} &= \gamma\wedge\mathcal{L}_X\gamma\otimes Y-\mathcal{L}_Y\gamma\wedge\gamma\otimes X\\ &\quad -d\gamma\wedge\iota_X\gamma\otimes Y-\iota_Y\gamma\wedge d\gamma\otimes X\\ &= \gamma\wedge\iota_X d\gamma\otimes Y-\mathcal{L}_Y\gamma\wedge\gamma\otimes X\\ &\quad -d\gamma\otimes Y-\gamma(Y)\,d\gamma\otimes X.\end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 10 it follows that

$$[\gamma\otimes X,\gamma\otimes Y]_{\mathcal{FN}}=-\mathcal{L}_Y\gamma\wedge\gamma\otimes X-\gamma(Y)\,d\gamma\otimes X \tag{5.5}$$

and by (5.3), (5.4) (5.5 and (5.2) we obtain

$$-\delta\alpha-(\alpha(X)+\gamma(Y))\,d\gamma-\mathcal{L}_Y\gamma\wedge\gamma=-\delta\alpha-\mathcal{L}_Y\gamma\wedge\gamma=0.$$

□

6. Levi-flat deformations and nonexistence of Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_2$

6.1. **Notations and setting.** In this paragraph we will use the following setting and notations which follow [7]:

Let M be a complex manifold and L a hypersurface of class C^k in M, $k\geqslant 2$; then there exists $r\in C^k(M)$, $dr\neq 0$ on L such that $L=\{z\in M:\ r(z)=0\}$ and set $j:L\to M$ the natural inclusion. As $dr\neq 0$ on a neighborhood of L in M we will suppose in the sequel that $dr\neq 0$ on M.

We denote by J the complex structure on M and let $\gamma=j^*(d_J^c r)$, $d_J^c r=-Jdr$. The Levi distribution $T(L)\cap JT(L)=\ker\ \gamma$ is integrable if and only if L is Levi flat and we will suppose in the sequel that L is Levi-flat.

Let g be a fixed Hermitian metric on M and $Z=grad_g r/\left\|grad_g r\right\|_g^2$. Then the vector field $X=JZ$ is tangent to L and verifies

$$\gamma(X)=d_J^c r(JZ)=1.$$

Definition 14. *For a given defining function r, we will fix this DGLA defining couple and we will call (γ,X) the canonical DGLA defining couple associated to the Levi foliation on L. When its dependence on the defining function r has to be emphasised, we will say the canonical DGLA defining couple associated to r.*

We will give now a parametrization of real hypersurfaces near a given hypersurface L and diffeomorphic to L as graphs over L:

Let U be a tubular neighborhood of L in M and $\pi:U\to L$ the projection on L along the integral curves of Z. As we are interested in infinitesimal deformations we suppose $U=M$.

Let $\mathcal{G}=C^k(L;\mathbb{R})$ and $a\in\mathcal{G}$. Denote

$$L_a=\{z\in M:\ r(z)=a(\pi(z))\}.$$

Since Z is transverse to L, L_a is a hypersurface in M. Consider the map $\Phi_a : M \to M$ defined by $\Phi_a(p) = q$, where

$$\pi(q) = \pi(p),\ r(q) = r(p) + a(\pi(p)). \tag{6.1}$$

In particular, for every $x \in L$ we have

$$r(\Phi_a(x)) = a(x). \tag{6.2}$$

Φ_a is a diffeomorphism of M such that $\Phi_a(L) = L_a$ and $\Phi_a^{-1} = \pi|_{L_a}$.

Conversely, let $\Psi \in \mathcal{U} \subset Diff(M)$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a suitable neighborhood of the identity in $Diff(M)$. Then there exists $a \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\Psi(L) = L_a$. Indeed, for $x \in L$, let $q(x) \in \Psi(L)$ such that $\pi(q(x)) = x$. By defining $a(x) = r(q(x))$, we obtain $\Psi(L) = L_a$.

So we have the following:

Lemma 12. *Let* $\Psi \in \mathcal{U}$. *There exists a unique* $a \in \mathcal{G}$ *such that* $\Psi(L) = L_a$.

If c is a constant in a suitable neighborhood I of the origin in $\mathbb{R}$ we define

$$L^c = \{z \in M :\ r(z) = c\}.$$

For every $x \in L$ and every $a \in \mathcal{G}$ we have

$$\Phi_a(x) = \Gamma_{Z,x} \cap L^{a(x)}, \tag{6.3}$$

where $\Gamma_{Z,x}$ is the integral curve of Z passing through x.

Set $\pi^c : M \to L^c$ the projection on L^c along the integral curves of Z. It is obvious that

$$L^0 = L,\ \pi^0 = \pi,$$

$$\pi \circ \pi^c = \pi \ for\ every\ c \in I.$$

For every $c \in I$ and every $w \in M$ we have

$$\pi^c(w) = \Gamma_{Z,w} \cap L^c \tag{6.4}$$

and in particular $\pi^c(\Phi_a(w)) = \Gamma_{Z,\Phi_a(w)} \cap L^c = \pi^c(w)$ for every $a \in \mathcal{G}$, i. e.

$$\pi^c \circ \Phi_a = \pi^c. \tag{6.5}$$

By (6.3) and (6.4) it follows that for every $x \in L$, we have also

$$\Phi_a(x) = \Gamma_{Z,x} \cap L^{a(x)} = \pi^{a(x)}(x). \tag{6.6}$$

Let $a \in \mathcal{G}$ such that L_a is Levi-flat, i.e. $TL_a \cap JTL_a$ is integrable. We will now define a DGLA defining couple for a foliation on L diffeomorphic with the Levi foliation on L_a:

Set $j_a : L_a \to M$ the natural embedding, $r_a = r - a \circ \pi$ and $\eta_a = j_a^*(d^c r_a) \in \Lambda^1(L_a)$. Therefore $L_a = \{z \in M :\ r_a = 0\}$ and $r \circ \Phi_a = r + a \circ \pi$. Since $\ker \eta_a = TL_a \cap JTL_a$, we may consider (η_a, Y_a) the canonical DGLA defining couple for the Levi foliation on L_a associated to r_a. So by setting $\gamma_a = \Phi_a^*(\eta_a) \in \Lambda^1(L)$ and $X_a = \left(\Phi_a^{-1}\right)_*(Y_a) \in \mathcal{H}(L)$, we have $\gamma_a(X_a) = 1$.

Since $\ker \eta_a$ is integrable, it follows that $\ker \gamma_a$ is integrable and so (γ_a, X_a) is a DGLA defining couple for the integrable distribution $\ker \gamma_a \subset TL$.

6.2. **Levi-flat deformations.** We recal that in the sequel we use the setting and the notations of the previous subsection: so, for a given Levi-flat hypersurface L in a complex manifold M, we will fix a defining function r, a Hermitian metric g on M, the canonical DGLA defining couple (γ, X) for the Levi foliation associated to r , $X = JZ$, $Z = grad_g r / \left\| grad_g r \right\|_g^2$. Also, for $a \in \mathcal{G}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we will use the meaning of L_a, Φ_a, j_a, r_a, η_a, γ_a, X_a, L^c, π^c defined before.

Definition 15. *A Levi-flat deformation of L is a differentiable family $\left(L_{a_t}\right)_{t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, where $\left(a_t\right)_{t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[}$ is a differentiable family in $\mathcal{G}$ and $a_0 = 0$, such that for every $t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[$, L_{a_t} is a C^k Levi-flat hypersurface in M.*

The purpose of this section is to show that if a Levi-flat deformation of a compact Levi-flat hypersurface L in a complex manifold is given by a family $\left(a_t\right)_{t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[}$ of functions in $\mathcal{G}$, then the function $p = \frac{da_t}{dt}_{|t=0}$ is constant on every minimal set for the Levi foliation of L.

Lemma 13. *Let $z \in M$ and set $c = r(z) \in I$. Then for every $W \in T_z M$ we have*

$$W = \pi^c_{*,z}(W) + (dr(z)(W)) Z(z).$$

Proof. Since $z \in L^c$, we have $\pi^c(z) = z$ and so the mapping $\pi^c_{*,z} : T_z M \to T_z L^c$ is the orthogonal projection on $T_z L^c$ by means of the metric induced by g. This implies that

$$W = \pi^c_{*,z}(W) + \frac{\langle W, Z(z) \rangle_g}{\langle Z(z), Z(z) \rangle_g} Z(z).$$

But

$$Z = grad_g r / \left\| grad_g r \right\|_g^2$$

and thus

$$\frac{\langle W, Z(z) \rangle_g}{\langle Z(z), Z(z) \rangle_g} = \langle W, grad_g r(z) \rangle_g = dr(z)(W).$$

□

Corollary 4. *For every $x \in L$, $V \in T_x M$ and $a \in \mathcal{G}$ we have*

$$(\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V) = \pi^{a(x)}_{*,x}(V) + (da(x)(V)) Z(\Phi_a(x)). \tag{6.7}$$

Proof. Let $x \in L$ fixed and $V \in T_x L$. Since $\Phi_{a\ |L} : L \to L_a$ is a diffeomorphism, $(\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V) \in T_{\Phi_a(x)}(L_a) \subset T_{\Phi_a(x)} M = T_{\Phi_a(x)} L^{a(x)} \oplus \mathbb{R}[Z(\Phi_a(x))]$. By Lemma 13

$$(\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V) = \pi^{a(x)}_{*,\Phi_a(x)}\left((\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\right) + dr\left((\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\right) Z(\Phi_a(x)). \tag{6.8}$$

But by (6.2) $r \circ \Phi_{a\ |L} = a$ and it follows that

$$dr\left((\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\right) = \left(d\left(r \circ \Phi_{a\ |L}\right)(x)\right)(V) = da(x)(V). \tag{6.9}$$

Moreover, by (6.5), for every $c \in I$ we have $\pi^c \circ \Phi_a = \pi^c$ and therefore by (6.6) we obtain

$$\pi^{a(x)}_{*,\Phi_a(x)}\left((\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\right) = \pi^{a(x)}_{*,x}(V). \tag{6.10}$$

By replacing (6.9) and (6.10) in (6.8) the Corollary is proved. □

Corollary 5. *For every $x \in L$, $V \in T_x M$ and $a \in \mathcal{G}$ we have*

$$\gamma_a(x)(V) = d^c r_a(x)\,\pi^{a(x)}_{*,x}(V).$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_a(x)(V) &= \Phi_a^*(\eta_a)(x)(V) = \eta_a(x)\Big((\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\Big)\\ &= \left(j_a^*(d^c r_a)\right)(x)\Big((\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\Big) = (d^c r_a)(x)\Big((j_a)_{*,\Phi_a(x)}(\Phi_a)_{*,x}(V)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 4 it follows that

$$\gamma_a(x)(V) = (d^c r_a)(x)\left((j_a)_{*,\Phi_a(x)}\left(\pi^{a(x)}_{*,x}(V) + (da(x)(V))\,Z(\Phi_a(x))\right)\right).$$

Since $(j_a)_{*,\Phi_a(x)}(Z(\Phi_a(x))) = 0$ and $\pi^{a(x)}_{*,x}(V) \in T_{\Phi_a(x)} L_a$ the Corollary follows. □

Proposition 4. *Let L be a Levi-flat hypersurface of class C^k in M, $k \geqslant 2$, and let $(a_t)_{t\in]-\varepsilon,\varepsilon[}$ be a differentiable family in $\mathcal{G}$ which defines a Levi-flat deformation of L. Set $p = \frac{da_t}{dt}_{|t=0}$. Then*

$$\frac{d\gamma_{a_t}}{dt}_{|t=0} = -d^c p.$$

Proof. By Corollary 5, for every $t \in]-\varepsilon,\varepsilon[$,

$$\gamma_{a_t}(x)(V) = d^c r_{a_t}(x)\left(\pi^{a_t(x)}_{*,x}(V)\right) \tag{6.11}$$

and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\gamma_{a_t}(x)(V)_{|t=0} &= \frac{d}{dt}\left(d^c r_{a_t}(x)\left(\pi^{a_t}_{*,x}(V)\right)\right)_{|t=0}\\ &= \left(\frac{d}{dt} d^c r_{a_t}\right)_{|t=0}(x)\left(\pi^{a_0}_{*,x}(V)\right) + d^c r(x)\,\frac{d}{dt}\left(\pi^{a_t}_{*,x}(V)\right)_{|t=0}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

We have

$$\pi \circ \pi^{a_t} = \pi,$$

so

$$\pi_* \circ \pi^{a_t}_* = \pi_*$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\pi_* \circ \pi^{a_t}_*\right) = \pi_* \frac{d\pi^{a_t}_*}{dt} = 0.$$

In particular for $x \in L$ and $V \in T_x L$,

$$\pi_*\left(\left(\frac{d\pi^{a_t}_{*,x}}{dt}\right)_{|t=0}(V)\right) = 0$$

and it follows that

$$\left(\frac{d\pi^{a_t}_{*,x}}{dt}\right)_{|t=0}(V) = \lambda_{x,V} Z(x),\ \ \lambda_{x,V} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore

$$d^c r(x)\,\frac{d}{dt}\left(\pi^{a_t}_{*,x}(V)\right)_{|t=0} = \lambda_{x,V}\, d^c r(x)\, Z(x) = 0$$

and from (6.12) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\gamma_{a_t}(x)(V)_{|t=0} = \left(\frac{d}{dt}d^c r_{a_t}\right)_{t=0}(x)(V).$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{d}{dt}d^c r_{a_t}\right)_{|t=0}(x)(V) &= \left(\frac{d}{dt}\left(d^c(r - a_t\circ\pi)_{|t=0}\right)\right)(x)(V)\\ &= -d^c\left(\frac{d(a_t\circ\pi)}{dt}\right)_{|t=0}(x)(V) =\\ &= -d^c\left(\left(\frac{da_t}{dt}\right)_{|t=0}\circ\pi\right)(x)(V)\\ &= -d^c p(x)(V)\end{aligned}$$

and the Proposition is proved. □

We recall the following

Definition 16. *Let X be a smooth manifold and $\mathcal{F}$ a foliation of X. A subset $A\subset X$ is invariant by $\mathcal{F}$ if every leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ which has a nonempty intersection with A is contained in A. A subset $\mathfrak{M}\subset X$ is a minimal for $\mathcal{F}$ if it is a minimal for the set of non empty subsets of X which are nonempty, closed and invariant by $\mathcal{F}$ ordered by inclusion.*

Remark 7. *Every compact invariant subset by a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ contains a minimal for $\mathcal{F}$.*

The following Proposition is a rigidity property for Levi flat deformations and represents a key step towards the proof of the nonexistence of Levi-flat hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{CP}_n$:

Proposition 5. *Let $(L_{a_t})_{t\in I}$, $a_t\in\mathcal{G}$, be a Levi-flat deformation of L. Set $\gamma=\gamma_0$, $X=X_0$, $p=\frac{da_t}{dt}_{|t=0}$.*

(1) *For every vector fields V, W on L tangent to the Levi distribution we have*

$$(dd^c p + \iota_X d\gamma\wedge d^c p)(V,W) = 0. \tag{6.13}$$

(2) *Suppose that L is compact and let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a minimal set for the Levi foliation of L. Let p be a real valued C^2 function on L verifying (6.13). Then p is constant on $\mathfrak{M}$.*

Proof. (1) Set

$$\alpha = \frac{d\gamma_{a_t}}{dt}_{|t=0}.$$

Let $V, W\in\mathfrak{X}(L)$ tangent to the Levi foliation. By Proposition 3, , we have

$$\delta\alpha(V,W) = 0$$

and by Proposition 4

$$\begin{aligned}-\delta a(V,W) &= \delta d^c p(V,W) = (dd^c p + \{\gamma, d^c p\})(V,W)\\ &= dd^c p(V,W) + (\mathcal{L}_X\gamma\wedge d^c p - \gamma\wedge\mathcal{L}_X d^c p)(V,W)\\ &= dd^c p(V,W) + (\mathcal{L}_X\gamma\wedge Jdp)(V,W)\\ &= dd^c p(V,W) + (\iota_X d\gamma\wedge d^c p)(V,W) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

(2) Set $\lambda = \sup\limits_{x \in \mathfrak{M}} p(x)$ and let $K = \{x \in \mathfrak{M} : \ p(x) = \lambda\}$.

Let $x \in K$. From (6.13) it follows that p verifies on the leaf L_x of the Levi foliation through x a second order elliptic equation of the form

$$\Delta p + \sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} c_i \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} = 0,$$

where $n = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} M$, $(x_1, \cdots, x_{2n-1})$ are local coordinates of L_x in the neighborhood of x, Δ is the Laplace operator and c_i are functions of class C^2.

The restriction of p to L_x has a maximum at x. By the strong maximum principle of Hopf (see [16], [12]), $p_{|L_x}$ is constant on a neighborhood of x in L_x. It follows that the set $\{x \in L_x : \ p(x) = \lambda\}$ is open and closed in L_x and thus p is constant on L_x. In particular $L_x \subset K$ and therefore K is invariant by the Levi foliation. By minimality, $K = \mathfrak{M}$ and the proposition is proved.

□

6.3. **Nonexistence of Levi-flat hypersurfaces.**

Proposition 6. *Let L be a Levi-flat hypersurface in a complex manifold M, $L = \{z \in L : \ r(z) = 0\}$, $r \in C^k(M)$, $k \geqslant 3$, $dr \neq 0$. Let Y be a holomorphic vector field on M and Ψ^Y be the flow of Y. We denote $\left(a_t^Y\right)_{t \in I}$ the family of $\mathcal{G}$ which gives the Levi-flat deformation $\left(\Psi_t^Y(L)\right)_{t \in I}$ of L and $p^Y = \frac{da_t^Y}{dt}_{|t=0}$. Then*

$$p^Y = \langle Y, grad_g r \rangle_g .$$

Proof. Let g be a fixed Hermitian metric on M and $Z = grad_g r / \|grad_g r\|_g^2$, where r is a C^3 defining function of L. For every z in a neighborhood of L we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Psi_t^Y(z) = Y\left(\Psi_t^Y(z)\right), \ \Psi_0^Y(z) = z. \tag{6.14}$$

For every $t \in I$ there exists $a_t^Y \in \mathcal{G}$ such that

$$\Psi_t^Y(L) = \Phi_{a_t^Y}(L). \tag{6.15}$$

By (6.2), for every $x \in L$,

$$a_t^Y(x) = r\left(\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x)\right). \tag{6.16}$$

From (6.15) it follows that for every $x \in L$, there exists a unique $y(t,x) \in L$ such that

$$\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x) = \Psi_t^Y(y(t,x)). \tag{6.17}$$

In particular, from (6.14), for every $x \in L$ we have

$$x = \Phi_{a_0^Y}(x) = \Psi_0^Y(y(0,x)) = y(0,x) \tag{6.18}$$

and

$$\Psi_{0,*}^Y = Id_{TL}, \tag{6.19}$$

$\Psi_{t,*}^Y$ being the derivative of Ψ_t^Y.

By (6.17) we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x) = \frac{d}{dt}\Psi_t^Y(y(t,x)) = \left(\frac{d}{dt}\Psi_t^Y\right)(y(t,x)) + \left(\left(\Psi_t^Y\right)_*(y(t,x))\right) \circ (y_{*,x}(t))$$

and by (6.14) and (6.18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x)_{|t=0} &= Y\left(\Psi_0^Y(y(0,x))\right)+\Psi_{0,*}^Y(x)\circ y_{*,x}(0) \\ &= Y(x)+y_{*,x}(0). \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

By (6.16), for every $x\in L$

$$r\left(\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x)\right)=a_t^Y(x)=tp^Y(x)+o(t),$$

which implies

$$p^Y(x)=\frac{d}{dt}r\left(\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x)\right)_{|t=0}=dr(x)\left(\frac{d}{dt}\Phi_{a_t^Y}(x)_{|t=0}\right)$$

and by (6.20) we obtain

$$p^Y(x)=dr(x)(Y(x)+y_{*,x}(0,x)). \tag{6.21}$$

Since $y_{*,x}(0,x)\in T_xL$ it follows that

$$p^Y(x)=dr(x)(Y(x))=\langle Y(x),grad_g r(x)\rangle_g.$$

□

Remark 8. *We point out that we identify holomorphic vector fields with their real part, i. e. with those vector fields* Y *satisfying* $[V,Y]+J[JV,Y]=0$ *for every* $V\in\mathcal{H}(M)$.

Remark 9. *The conclusion of Proposition 6 is also valid for a deformation of a codimension* 1 *integrable distribution on a* C^2 *hypersurface* N *in a smooth manifold* X*, if the deformation is given by the flow of a smooth vector field on* X.

We will use the following elementary

Lemma 14. *Let* x,y *two distinct points of* $\mathbb{CP}_n$, $v\in T_x(\mathbb{CP}_n), w\in T_y(\mathbb{CP}_n)$. *There exists a holomorphic vector field* Y *on* $\mathbb{CP}_n$ *such that* $Y(x)=v$, $Y(y)=w$.

Proof. Let $A\in Hom_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{n+1},\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\right)$ and $\widetilde{F}_t=\exp tA$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$. $\widetilde{F}_t$ induces an automorphism F_t of $\mathbb{CP}_n$. Let $\pi:\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\backslash\{0\}\to\mathbb{CP}_n$ the canonical projection. Consider the holomorphic vector field Y on $\mathbb{CP}_n$ defined by $Y(\pi(x))=\frac{dF_t(\pi(x))}{dt}_{|t=0}$, $x\in\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\backslash\{0\}$. Since

$$\frac{d}{dt}(F_t(\pi(x)))_{|t=0}=\frac{d}{dt}\left(\pi\left(\widetilde{F}_t(x)\right)\right)_{|t=0}=\pi_{*x}\frac{d\widetilde{F}_t(x)}{dt}_{|t=0}=\pi_{*x}A(x)$$

it follows that $Y=\pi_*A$. It suffices to choose A such that $\pi_{*x}A(x)=v$ and $\pi_{*y}A(y)=w$. □

The main result of this paper, who's proof is similar to the proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 of [7], is the following:

Theorem 6. *There are no* C^k *Levi-flat hypersurfaces in* $\mathbb{CP}_n$ *for* $n\geqslant 2$ *and* $k\geqslant 3$.

Proof. Let L be a C^k Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$. We consider $\mathfrak{M}$ a minimal set for the Levi foliation of L, which is a non empty compact subset of L invariant by the Levi foliation. Let x_0,y_0 be distinct points of $\mathfrak{M}$. By Lemma 14 there exists a holomorphic vector field Y^0 on $\mathbb{CP}_n$ such that $Y^0(x_0)=0$ and $Y^0(y_0)=$

$(grad_g r)(y_0)$. Let $\Psi_t^{Y^0}$ the flow of Y^0. Then $\left(\Psi_t^{Y^0}(L)\right)_{t\in I}$ is a Levi-flat deformation of L and let $\left(a_t^{Y^0}\right)_{t\in I}$ be a family in $\mathcal{G}$ defining this Levi-flat deformation of L. Set $p^{Y^0} = \frac{da_t^{Y^0}}{dt}_{|t=0}$. By Proposition 6

$$p^{Y^0} = \left\langle Y^0, grad_g r\right\rangle_g, \tag{6.22}$$

and by Proposition 5 the function p^{Y^0} is constant on $\mathfrak{M}$. Since $Y^0(x_0) = 0$, by (6.22) it follows that $p^{Y^0} = 0$. But $p^{Y^0}(y_0) = \|grad_g r(y_0)\|_g^2 \neq 0$ and this gives a contradiction. □

The proof of Theorem 6 gives also the following

Corollary 6. *Let M be a complex manifold such that for every distinct points x, y of M and every $v \in T_x(M), w \in T_y(M)$, there exists a holomorphic vector field Y on M such that $Y(x) = v$, $Y(y) = w$. Then there are no C^3 Levi-flat hypersurfaces in M.*

Remark 10. *If we suppose that L is a real analytic Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}_n$, by* [21] *there exists a holomorphic foliation $\mathcal{F}_L$ on $\mathbb{CP}_n$ extending the Levi foliation on L and by D. Cerveau's dichotomy* [6], *L is an exceptional minimal for $\mathcal{F}_L$. So, in this case, the contradiction in the proof of Theorem 6 is obtained by the fact that p^{Y^0} is constant on L.*

Acknowledgement 1. *We would like to thank M. Adachi who noticed some inexactitudes in the first version of our paper.*

References

1. M. Adachi and J. Brinkschulte, *A global estimate for the Diederich-Fornaess index of weakly pseudoconvex domains*, Preprint (2014).
2. ———, *Curvature restrictions for Levi-flat real hypersurfaces in complex projective planes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, to appear (2015).
3. H. Bremermann, *Über die äquivalenz der pseuudokonvexen Gebiete uned der Holomorphiegebiete in Raum von n komplexen Veränderlichen*, Math. Ann. **128** (1954), 63–91.
4. C. Camacho, A. Lins Neto and P. Sad, *Minimal sets of foliations in complex projective space*, Publ. Math. de I.H.E.S. **68** (1988), 187–203.
5. E. Cartan, *Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de l'espace de deux variables complexes*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **11** (1932), 17–90.
6. D. Cerveau, *Minimaux des feuilletages algébriques de $\mathbb{CP}^n$*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **43** (1993), 1535–1543.
7. P. de Bartolomeis and A. Iordan, *Deformations of Levi flat hypersurfaces in complex manifolds*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **48** (2015), no. 2, 281–311.
8. P. de Bartolomeis and S. V. Matveev, *Some remarks on Nijenhuis bracket, formality and Khler manifolds*, Advances in Geometry **13** (2013), 571–581.
9. P. de Bartolomeis and A. Tomassini, *Exotic deformations of Calabi-Yau manifolds*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **63** (2013), 391–415.
10. A. Frölicher and A. Nijenhuis, *Theory of vector valued differential forms*, Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet. Amsterdam **59** (1956), 338–359.
11. S. Fu and M.-C. Shaw, *The Diederich-Fornaess exponent and non-existence of Stein domains with Levi-flat boundaries*, J. of Geom. Analysis, to appear (2015).
12. D. Gilgarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
13. C. Godbillon, *Feuilletages: Etudes géométriques*, Birkhäuser Verlag, 1991.
14. A. Haefliger, *Variétés feuilletées*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa **16** (1962), 367–397.

15. G. M. Henkin and A. Iordan, *Regularity of $\overline{\partial}$ on pseudoconcave compacts and applications*, Asian J. Math. **4** (2000), no. 4, 855–884, and Erratum to : Regularity of $\overline{\partial}$ on pseudoconcave compacts and applications by G. M. Henkin and A. Iordan, Asian J. Math., 4, 855-884, 2000.
16. E. Hopf, *Elementare bemerkngen ber die lsungen partieller differentialgleichungen zweiter ordnung vom elliptischen typus*, Sitz. Ber. Preuss. Acad. Wissensch. Berlin Math-Phys. KI **19** (1927), 147–152.
17. A Iordan and F. Matthey, *Régularité de l'opérateur $\overline{\partial}$ et théorème de Siu sur la nonexistence d'hypersurfaces Levi-plates dans l'espace projectif complexe $\mathbb{CP}^n$, $n \geqslant 3$*, C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris **346** (2008), 395–400.
18. K. Kodaira and D. Spencer, *Multifoliate structures*, Ann. of Math. **74** (1961), no. 1, 52–100.
19. E. E. Levi, *Studii sui punti singolari essenziali delle funzioni analitiche eli due o piu variabili complesse*, Annali di Mat. **17** (1910), 61–87.
20. P. W. Michor, *Topics in differential geometry*, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island, 2008.
21. A. Lins Neto, *A note on projective Levi flats and minimal sets of algebraic foliation*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **49** (1999), 1369–1385.
22. L. Ni and J. Wolfson, *The Lefschetz theorem for CR submanifolds and the nonexistence of real analytic Levi flat submanifolds*, Communications in Analysis and Geometry **11** (2003), 553–564.
23. F. Norguet, *Sur les domaines d'holomorphie des fonctions uniformes de plusieurs variables complexes*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **82** (1954), 137–158.
24. K. Oka, *Sur les fonctions de plusieurs variables. IX. Domaines finis sans point critique intérieur*, Jap. J. Math. **23** (1953), 97–155.
25. Y.-T. Siu, *Nonexistence of smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces in complex projective spaces of dimension* $\geqslant 3$, Ann. of Math. **151** (2000), 1217–1243.
26. ———, *$\overline{\partial}$-regularity for weakly pseudoconvex domains in compact Hermitian symmetric spaces with respect to invariant metrics*, Ann. of Math. **156** (2002), 595–621.
27. F. Sommer, *Komplex-analytische Blätterung reeller Hyperflächen im C^n*, Math.Ann **137** (1959), 392–411.
28. H. J. Sussmann, *Orbits of families of vector fields and integrability of distributions*, Transactions of A. M. S. **180** (1973), 171–188.

Università degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica "U. Dini", Viale Morgagni 67/A I-50134, Firenze, Italia
E-mail address: `paolo.debartolomeis@unifi.it`

Institut de Mathématiques, UMR 7586 du CNRS, case 247, Université Pierre et Marie-Curie, 4 Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France
E-mail address: `andrei.iordan@imj-prg.fr`